Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/599,124	NAKAYAMA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mi'schita' Henson	2857
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):		
(1) Mi'schita' Henson.	(3)Steven Wegman.	
(2)	(4)	
Date of Interview: 17 February 2009.		
Type: a) Z Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☑ No. If Yes, brief description:		
Claim(s) discussed: 12.		
Identification of prior art discussed: Not Applicable.		
Agreement with respect to the claims f)⊠ was reached. g)□ was not reached. h)□ N/A.		
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>Discussed correction of palim 12 line 5, via Examiner's Admendment, fo recile</u> — <u>internshistion and reception port—instead of Transmission natures to this change.</u>		
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)		
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NITREVIEW. (See MFEP Section 7.13A) if a rely to the law Office action has already been fined. APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS TITEMIEW DATE OR THE MALLING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO RILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview.		